Remarks

Status

Claims 1-4, 6-27 and 29-85 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 16, 31, 48, 67, 71 and 79 being the independent claims. In the January 15, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of the claims. It is submitted that all of the currently pending claims (1-4, 6-27 and 29-85) are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed below.

Interview

Applicants would like to thank Examiners Chung and Srivastava for the personal interview conducted April 20, 2004. In the interview Applicants discussed aspects of the present invention, details of the prior art references and differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. The discussion also included reasons why the independent claims should be allowable over U.S. Patent No. 6,286,142 to Ehreth and U.S. Patent No. 5,574,964 to Hamlin. Specifically, Applicants suggested that neither Ehreth nor Hamlin, alone or in combination, disclose all of the features of the independent claims including at least a residential gateway that receives channel select commands directly from a remote control. The Examiner stated that further consideration and/or search would be conducted upon the filing of a Response or Amendment.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

Under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1, 31 and 67 as being obvious over claim 1 of co-pending Application No. 09/443,744. Under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 16, 48, 71 and 70 as being obvious over claim 3 of co-pending Application No. 09/443,744. The Applicant submits that this rejection is

improper because no explanation is given as to how the claims correspond to the present claim and because co-pending Application No. 09/443,744 is drawn to a machine for tooling parts and has no relevance to a residential gateway. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection should be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 10, 13, 15, 31, 35-39, 42, 45 and 47

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 10, 13, 15, 31, 35-39, 42, 45 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,286,142 to Ehreth. It is submitted that the amended claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of decoding and distributing video signals from a residential gateway. The method includes receiving, by a wireless receiver within the residential gateway, a channel select command from a remote control associated with one of the plurality of televisions. A video signal is received from a telecommunications network and a series of video packets corresponding to the channel select command is constructed from the video signal. The series of video packets is transported to a video decoder and decoded to produce a television signal which is transmitted to a television.

It is respectfully submitted the Ehreth does not disclose or suggest a method as recited in independent claim 1. For example, Ehreth does not disclose "a wireless receiver which receives channel select commands transmitted directly from the at least one remote control device associated with a respective television. Ehreth discloses a remote control 70 transmits a channel select command to channel selection and signaling unit 50 which sends a signal, at a user selectable frequency, to the receiver 80 that is within the residential gateway 30. Network interface 32 receives a video signal from the telecommunications network 40 and transports the signal to the modulating unit 34. Modulating unit 34 modulates the video signal to a frequency, which matches the user selected frequency of channel selection and signal unit 50, and transmits the modulated video signal to the receiver 80. Receiver 80 transmits the video signal over media 90 to the channel selection and signaling units 50 and only the channel selection and signaling

unit that is set to match the frequency will receive the video signal. Channel selection and signaling unit 50 transmits a television signal to a television at a fixed frequency. In short, Ehreth discloses that the channel selection and signaling unit receives a channel select command from the remote control and transmits a signal over a wire to residential gateway 30. Clearly, this differs from the claimed wireless receiver, located within the residential gateway, for directly receiving channel select commands from a remote control device.

Claims 2-4, 10, 13 and 15 depend upon independent claim 1 and are submitted to patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 1 and for the further features recited therein.

Independent claim 31 is directed to a method of receiving and decoding signals from a telecommunications network and transmitting decoded signals from a residential gateway to a plurality of devices. The method includes connecting the residential gateway to the telecommunications network and to each of the plurality of devices. A television channel to view is selected by programming a remote control device. The channel select command is received directly by a receiver within the residential gateway without transmission through an active electronic device. The channel select command is transmitted to the telecommunications network and video signal, corresponding to the channel selected, is received. The received video signal is converted, decoded and transmitted to a television.

It is respectfully submitted the Ehreth does not disclose or suggest a method as recited in independent claim 31. For example, Ehreth does not disclose a receiver within the residential gateway that directly receives channel select commands directly from a remote control device "without transmission through an active electronic device". Ehreth discloses a remote control 70 transmits a channel select command to channel selection and signaling unit 50 which sends a signal, at a user selectable frequency, to the receiver 80 that is within the residential gateway 30. Network interface 32 receives a video signal from the telecommunications network 40 and transports the signal to the modulating unit 34. Modulating unit 34 modulates the video signal to a frequency, which matches the user selected frequency of channel selection and signal unit 50, and transmits the modulated video signal to the receiver 80. Receiver 80 transmits the video signal over media 90 to the channel selection and signaling units 50 and only the channel

selection and signaling unit that is set to match the frequency will receive the video signal. Channel selection and signaling unit transmits a television signal to a television frequency. In short, Ehreth discloses that the channel selection and signaling unit, is an active device, which receives a channel select command from the remote control and transmits a signal over a wire to residential gateway 30.

Claims 35-39, 42, 45 and 47 are dependent upon independent claim 31 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 31 and for the further features recited therein.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, 40 and 41

In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 7, 8, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,574,964 to Hamlin. Claim 5 has been cancelled, claims 7 and 8 depend upon independent claim 1 and claims 40 and 41 depend upon independent claim 31. As discussed in detail above, Ehreth does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 31. Hamlin discloses a signal distribution system having a residential gateway 34, a system controller 38, a signal transceiver 40, multiple receiving units 46, interface pods 44 and a remote control device 42. The system controller 38 stores data therein related to the multiple receiving units. In operation, a channel select command is received from remote control 42 at the signal transceiver 40 which converts the signal to electrical signal that is sent to system controller 38. System controller 38 interprets the command and outputs a control signal to residential gateway 34 which in turn sends a signal over media to a selected interface pod 44. Interface pod transmits the signal to the receiving unit 46. Thus, Hamlin fails to disclose or suggest receiving at a receiver within the gateway, a channel select command directly from a remote control.

The teachings of Hamlin may not be used to modify Ehreth without destroying Ehreth. As described in detail above with respect to claim 1, the channel selection and receiving unit 50 must transmit a signal upstream to the receiver 80 in order for the modulating unit 34 to select a frequency to send the modulated signal. This modulated signal is sent to all of the channel

selection and signaling units 50 located in a building, but only the channel selection and signaling unit 50 that is set to the proper frequency will receive the modulated signaling. Modifying Ehreth with the teachings of Hamlin would result in a single remote control that transmits a command signal to a control device. This would require replacing the channel selection and signaling units 50 with interface pods and replacing the residential gateway 30 with a new residential gateway and separate control device that controls the gateway. This essentially removes all of the elements taught by Ehreth and results in Hamlin. Thus, Hamlin can not be used to modify Ehreth.

For the reasons detailed above, claims 7, 8, 40 and 41, are allowable over Ehreth and Hamlin, combined or alone, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 34

In paragraph 5, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,379,453 to Tigwell. Claim 6 depends upon independent claim 1 and claim 34 depends upon independent claim 31. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and 31. Tigwell discloses a remote a control system and is provided solely to teach a remote control device that emits UHF signals. Therefore, Tigwell fails to alleviate any of the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin.

For the reasons detailed above, claims 6 and 34 are allowable over Ehreth, Hamlin and Tigwell, combined or alone, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9

In paragraph 6, the Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,500,691 to Martin. Claim 9 depends upon independent claim 1. As detailed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1. Martin is provided to disclose a receiver that can receive two types of signals from a remote control. Therefore, Martin fails to alleviate any of the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Furthermore, the rejection is unclear because the Examiner stated "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ehreth in view of Hamlin to

have two types of receivers..." It is unclear as to how adding two types of receivers to the gateway of Ehreth would result in the claimed invention that has only one receiver.

For the reasons detailed above, claim 9 is allowable over Ehreth, Hamlin and Martin, combined or alone, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 43

In paragraph 7, the Examiner rejected claims 11 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth. Claim 11 depends upon independent claim 1 and claim 43 depends upon independent claim 31 and both are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 1 and 31 and for the further features recited therein.

Claims 12 and 44

In paragraph 8, the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,596,373 to White. Claim 12 depends upon independent claim 1 and claim 44 depends upon independent claim 31. As detailed above, Ehreth fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and 31. White is provided to teach producing a television signal in an S-video format and fails to alleviate any of the deficiencies of Ehreth. Therefore, claims 12 and 44 are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 1 and 31 and for the further features recited therein.

Claims 14 and 46

In paragraph 9, the Examiner rejected claims 14 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,864 to Bindlish. Claim 14 depends upon independent claim 1 and claim 46 depends upon independent claim 31. As detailed above, Ehreth fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and 31. Bindlish is provided to teach decoding a video signal associated with three separate channels and fails to alleviate any of the deficiencies of Ehreth. Therefore, claims 14 and 46 are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 1 and 31 and for the further features recited therein.

Claims 16-20, 22, 23, 25, 28, 48-50, 52-55, 57, 60, 63, 66 and 67

In paragraph 10, the Examiner rejected claims 16-20, 22, 23, 25, 28, 48-50, 52-55, 57, 60, 63, 66 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,515,511 to Nguyen. Claim 28 has been cancelled.

Claim 16 is drawn to a residential gateway for distributing video signals to a plurality of televisions located at separate locations. The residential gateway has a receiver for receiving channel select commands from a remote control device, a network interface module, a plurality of video processors and a device for transmitting a television signal to a television.

It is respectfully submitted that Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a residential gateway as recited in independent claim 16. For example, neither Ehreth nor Hamlin teach or suggest a device for transmitting a television signal "to a television located in close proximity to the residential gateway and connected directly to the gateway with no active devices there between." As detailed above, Ehreth discloses that the residential gateway 30 transmits television signals downstream through channel selection and signaling unit 50, which is an active electronic device, to the television 100. Hamlin discloses transmitting television signals from gateway 34 to pod 44, which is an active device, to a television unit 46.

Furthermore, the teachings of Hamlin may not be used to modify Ehreth without destroying Ehreth. As described in detail above with respect to claim 1, the channel selection and receiving unit 50 must transmit a signal upstream to the receiver 80 in order for the modulating unit 34 to select a frequency to send the modulated signal. This modulated signal is sent to all of the channel selection and signaling units 50 located in a building, but only the channel selection and signaling unit 50 that is set to the proper frequency will receive the modulated signaling. Modifying Ehreth with the teachings of Hamlin would result in a single remote control that transmits a command signal to a control device. This would require replacing the channel selection and signaling units 50 with interface pods and replacing the residential gateway 30 with a new residential gateway and separate control device that controls the gateway. This essentially removes all of the elements taught by Ehreth and results in Hamlin. Thus, Hamlin can not be used to modify Ehreth.

Claims 17-20, 22, 23, 25 and 28 are dependent upon independent claim 16 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 16 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 48 is drawn to a residential gateway that receives and decodes video signals from a telecommunications network and transmits video signals to a plurality of devices. The gateway includes a receiver for directly receiving channel select commands from remote control devices associated with multiple televisions and the channel select commands are received "without being processed by an active electronic device". A network interface module transmits signals to the telecommunications network and receives video signals from the telecommunications network. The video signals are converted into a series of video packets which are decoded into television signals and transmitted to the corresponding televisions.

It is respectfully submitted that Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a residential gateway as recited in independent claim 48. For example, Ehreth does not disclose a receiver within the residential gateway that directly receives channel select commands directly from a remote control device "without being processed by an active electronic device". Ehreth discloses that the channel selection and signaling unit, is an active device, which receives a channel select command from the remote control, processes the channel select signal to obtain a signal with a user selected frequency and transmits a signal over a wire to residential gateway 30. Hamlin discloses a signal distribution system having a residential gateway 34, a system controller 38, a signal transceiver 40, multiple receiving units 46, interface pods 44 and a remote control device 42. The system controller 38 stores data therein related to the multiple receiving units. In operation, a channel select command is received from remote control 42 at the signal transceiver 40 which converts the signal to electrical signal that is sent to system controller 38. System controller 38 is an active device that interprets the command and outputs a control signal to residential gateway 34 which in turn sends a signal over media to a selected interface pod 44. Interface pod transmits the signal to the receiving unit 46. Thus, Hamlin fails to disclose or suggest receiving at a receiver within the gateway, a channel select command directly from a remote control without the channel select command being processed by an active electronic device. Also, Hamlin can not be used to modify Ehreth for the reasons detailed above.

Claims 49, 50, 52-55, 57, 60, 63 and 66 are dependent upon independent claim 48 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 48 and for the further features recited therein.

With regards to claim 67, the Examiner fails to specifically address the features of the claim and the Examiner rejects claim 67 in paragraph 19. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 67 was inadvertently listed in paragraph 10 and claim 67 will be addressed below.

Claims 21 and 51

In paragraph 11, the Examiner rejected claims 21 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin and further in view of Nguyen further in view of Tigwell. Claim 21 depends upon independent claim 16 and claim 51 depends upon independent claim 48. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 16 and 48. Furthermore, neither Nguyen nor Tigwell alleviate the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claims 21 and 51 are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 16 and 48 and for the further features recited therein.

Claims 24 and 56

In paragraph 12, the Examiner rejected claims 24 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin and further in view of Martin. Claim 24 depends upon independent claim 16 and claim 56 depends upon independent claim 48. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 16 and 48. Furthermore, Martin fails to alleviate the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claims 24 and 56 are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 16 and 48 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 27

In paragraph 14, the Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin and further in view of White. Claim 27 depends upon independent claim 16. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination,

fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 16. Furthermore, White fails to alleviate the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claim 27 is submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 1 and for the further features recited therein.

Claims 29 and 61

In paragraph 15, the Examiner rejected claims 29 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin in view of Nguyen and further in view of Bindlish. Claim 29 depends upon independent claim 16 and claim 61 depends upon independent claim 48. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 16 and 48. Furthermore, neither Nguyen nor Bindlish alleviates the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claims 29 and 61 are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 16 and 48 and for the further features recited therein.

Claims 30, 62, 64 and 65

In paragraph 16, the Examiner rejected claims 30, 62, 64 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin in further in view of Nguyen. Claim 30 depends upon independent claim 16 and claims 62, 64 and 65 depend upon independent claim 48. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 16 and 48. Furthermore, neither Nguyen nor Bindlish alleviates the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claims 30, 62, 64 and 65 are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 16 and 48 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 59

In paragraph 18, the Examiner rejected claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin in further view of Nguyen in further view of White. Claim 59 depends upon independent claim 48. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 59. Furthermore, neither Nguyen nor White alleviates the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claim 59

is submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 48 and for the further features recited therein.

Claims 67, 69, 71-75 and 77

In paragraph 19, the Examiner rejected claims 67, 69, 71-75 and 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin.

Claim 67 is drawn to a method of distributing video signals to at least two televisions. The method includes receiving channel select commands including a first channel select command received directly from an optical remote control device associated with a first television and a second channel select command from a second remote control device associated with the second television, "wherein the first channel select command is received directly from the remote control to the residential gateway and the second channel select command is received from the second remote control device by the gateway over media without being passed through an active electronic device." A video signal is received at a network interface from a telecommunications network and transported to a video processor located within the residential gateway. The video signal is processed to produce first and second television signals corresponding to the respective first and second channel select commands. The first television signal is transmitted to the first television and second television is transmitted to the second television.

It is respectfully submitted that Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a method as recited in independent claim 67. For example, Ehreth does not disclose receiving directly from a remote control a first channel select command and a receiving a channel select command from a second remote control without the second channel select command being passed through an active electronic device. As detailed above, Ehreth clearly discloses (col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 29) that both of the first channel select command and the second channel select command are received by the channel selection and signaling unit 50 associated with each television 100. The first channel selection and signaling unit 50 (for example the top unit) receives the first channel select command and transmits a signal at a first user selected frequency to the gateway 30. The second channel selection and signaling unit 50 (for example the bottom unit) receives the second channel select command and transmits a signal

at a second user selected frequency to the gateway 30, the first and second frequencies are different. Thus, Hamlin discloses that both the first channel select command and the second channel select command are received by a channel selecting and signaling unit, which is an active electronic device, and then the channel selecting and signaling units transmit signals to the gateway at two different frequencies. Hamlin discloses using a single remote control 42 to control all of the devices located in the home. The signal from this single remote control device is received at signal transceiver 40 and transmitted to system controller 38. System controller 38 processes the signal with stored control programs and sends a signal to the gateway 34. Thus, Hamlin fails to disclose or suggest using two different remote controls or that the receiver receives a channel select command without the channel select command being passed through an active electronic device.

The teachings of Hamlin may not be used to modify Ehreth without destroying Ehreth. As described in detail above with respect to claim 1, the channel selection and receiving unit 50 must transmit a signal upstream to the receiver 80 in order for the modulating unit 34 to select a frequency to send the modulated signal. This modulated signal is sent to all of the channel selection and signaling units 50 located in a building, but only the channel selection and signaling unit 50 that is set to the proper frequency will receive the modulated signaling. Modifying Ehreth with the teachings of Hamlin would result in a single remote control that transmits a command signal to a control device. This would require replacing the channel selection and signaling units 50 with interface pods and replacing the residential gateway 30 with a new residential gateway and separate control device that controls the gateway. This essentially removes all of the elements taught by Ehreth and results in Hamlin. Thus, Hamlin can not be used to modify Ehreth.

Claim 71 is drawn to a residential gateway for decoding and distributing video signals received from a telecommunications network to at least two televisions. The gateway includes a receiver that directly receives channel select commands from a first remote control "without the channel select commands being processed by an active electronic device." A remote control module processes the channel select commands and a network interface module receives video signals from the telecommunications network that correspond to the channel select commands processed by the remote control module. A video processor processes the received video signals

to produce first and second television signals corresponding to the respective first and second channel select commands.

It is respectfully submitted that Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a method as recited in independent claim 71. For example, as detailed above, both Ehreth and Hamlin fail to disclose or suggest a residential gateway having a receiver that receives channel select commands from a remote control without the channel select commands being processed by an active device. Also, as detailed above, Hamlin can not be used to modify Ehreth.

Claims 72-75 and 77 depend upon independent claim 71 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 71 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 68

In paragraph 20, the Examiner rejected claim 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view of Hamlin in further view of White. Claim 68 depends upon independent claim 67. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 67. Furthermore, White fails to alleviate the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claim 68 is submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 67 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 70

In paragraph 21, the Examiner rejected claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view Hamlin in further view of Nguyen in further view of White. Claim 70 depends upon independent claim 67. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 67. Furthermore, neither Nguyen nor White alleviates the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claim 70 is submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 67 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 76

In paragraph 22, the Examiner rejected claim 76 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view Hamlin in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,443 to Decker. Claim 76 depends upon independent claim 67. The Examiner fails to provide any teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Decker to Ehreth in view of Hamlin. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper and it is requested that the rejection should be withdrawn. Furthermore, as discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 67. Decker discloses an entertainment and information system that uses modulators to for modulating signals. Decker fails to alleviate the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claim 76 is submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 67 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 78

In paragraph 23, the Examiner rejected claim 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view Hamlin in further view of White. Claim 78 depends upon independent claim 71. As discussed above, Ehreth and Hamlin, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 71. Furthermore, White fails to alleviate the deficiencies of Ehreth and Hamlin. Therefore, claim 78 is submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 71 and for the further features recited therein.

Claims 79-82

In paragraph 24, the Examiner rejected claim 79 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view Hamlin in further view of White.

Claim 79 is drawn to a residential gateway for decoding and distributing signals from a telecommunications network to a plurality of devices including multiple televisions. The residential includes a network interface module, a main MPEG processor, an optical receiver that receives channel select commands as wireless signals and a device for transferring signals between the network interface module and the main MPEG processor.

It is respectfully submitted that Ehreth, Hamlin and White, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a residential gateway as recited in claim 79. For example, as detailed

above none of the references suggest or disclose a residential gateway having a receiver that "receives channel select command as wireless signals."

Although claims 80-82 are not listed in the 35 U.S.C. rejection of paragraph 24, the claims are referred to below the rejection of claim 79 are assumed to be rejected for the reasons given with regards to claim 79. Claims 80-82 depend upon independent claim 79 are submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 79 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 83

In paragraph 25, the Examiner rejected claim 83 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view Hamlin in further view of White in further view of Decker. Claim 83 depends upon independent claim 79. As discussed above, Ehreth, Hamlin and White, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 79. Furthermore, Decker fails to alleviate the deficiencies of Ehreth, Hamlin and White. Therefore, claim 83 is submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 79 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 84

In paragraph 26, the Examiner rejected claim 84 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view Hamlin in further view of White in further view of Nguyen. Claim 84 depends upon independent claim 79. As discussed above, Ehreth, Hamlin and White, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 79. Furthermore, Nguyen fails to alleviate the deficiencies of Ehreth, Hamlin and White. Therefore, claim 84 is submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 79 and for the further features recited therein.

Claim 85

In paragraph 27, the Examiner rejected claim 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ehreth in view Hamlin in further view of White in further view of Nguyen. Claim 85 depends upon independent claim 79. As discussed above, Ehreth, Hamlin and White, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 79.

Furthermore, Nguyen fails to alleviate the deficiencies of Ehreth, Hamlin and White. Therefore, claim 85 is submitted to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 79 and for the further features recited therein.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 6-27 and 29-85 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-4, 6-27 and 29-85 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions, concerns, or if the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner should contact the undersigned to discuss.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/17/2004

Craig A. Hallacher
Reg. No. 54,896

Technology, Patents and Licensing Inc.
6206 Kellers Church Road
Pipersville, PA 18947

Phone: (215) 766-2100
Fax: (215) 766-2920
email challacher@techpats.com